

Revision Log

<i>Revision No.</i>	<i>Effective Date</i>	<i>Prepared By</i>	<i>Description of Changes</i>	<i>Affected Pages</i>
Revision 0	10/23/00	Larry Maassen	New Procedure	All
Revision 1	10/19/01	Larry Maassen	Scoring criteria and associated attachments extensively revised.	Pages 4-13
Reviewed	06/24/2004	Mark Thacker	Deemed adequate.	All

Subcontractor Evaluation

Table of Contents

1.0	PURPOSE	4
2.0	SCOPE.....	4
3.0	REFERENCES	4
4.0	DEFINITIONS	4
5.0	RESPONSIBLE PERSONNEL.....	4
6.0	PROCEDURE	5
7.0	RECORDS.....	6
8.0	TRAINING.....	6
9.0	ATTACHMENTS	6

Subcontractor Evaluation

1.0 PURPOSE

This quality procedure (QP) states the responsibilities and describes the process for evaluation of subcontractors who supply services to the ER Project. This procedure is intended as a tool to document subcontractor performance.

2.0 SCOPE

This QP is a mandatory document and shall be implemented by ER Project personnel when evaluating subcontractors who supply services to the ER Project for the ER Project.

3.0 REFERENCES

ER Project personnel using this procedure should become familiar with the contents of the following documents to properly implement this QP.

- ER Project Quality Management Plan located at http://erinternal.lanl.gov/home_links/Library_proc.htm.
- QP-2.2, Personnel Orientation and Training
- QP-3.2, Lessons Learned
- QP-4.4, Record Transmittal to the Records Processing Facility

4.0 DEFINITIONS

- 4.1 Administrative deliverable — A deliverable required to track work under the contract or task order such as accrual information or percent-spent information.
- 4.2 Baseline deliverable — A deliverable scheduled in the ER Project's annual baseline.
- 4.3 Regulatory deliverable — A deliverable required by the Administrative Authority (AA) such as a deliverable listed on the Project's Annual Work Schedule contained in the Installation Work Plan, a response to a Request for Supplemental Information or any other request from the AA.

5.0 RESPONSIBLE PERSONNEL

The following personnel are responsible for activities identified in Section 6.0 of this procedure.

- 5.1 BUS Contracts Administrator

- 5.2 Focus Area Project Leader (FAPL)
- 5.3 University Technical Representative (UTR)

6.0 PROCEDURE

6.1 Perform Subcontractor Evaluation

- 6.1.1 The **UTR** rates the subcontractor's operational and safety performance (Attachment A) by assigning a score (on Attachments B and C, respectively) to each evaluation criterion from the number specified in the column that most accurately represents the Subcontractor's performance for that evaluation criterion.
- 6.1.2 The **UTR** must take into account circumstances that are beyond the control of the subcontractor when evaluating their performance; however, these circumstances require timely communication by the subcontractor to the UTR for appropriate management action, e.g., baseline change control.
- 6.1.3 The **UTR** must provide a brief written explanation for each scoring unless it received a "Satisfactory."
- 6.1.4 The **UTR** must provide a brief written narrative on the overall general performance of the subcontractor in the space provided in Attachment B.
- 6.1.5 The **UTR** must perform an evaluation at the conclusion of all Task Orders or Subcontracts. For tasks with a duration of a year or longer, an evaluation must be performed periodically, at intervals ranging from quarterly (recommended), to annually at a minimum. This period is at the discretion of the UTR.
- 6.1.6 The evaluation must be done in consultation with the ESH-5 Safety Representative, and a Quality Integration and Improvement Team member.
- 6.1.7 After finishing the evaluation, the **UTR** signs the completed report forms (Attachments B and C) and submits them to the FAPL (or to a higher level of project management) for review and concurrence.
- 6.1.8 After management concurrence, the **FAPL** submits the completed reports to the BUS Contracts Administrator.
- 6.1.9 The **BUS Contracts Administrator** reviews, signs, and forwards copies of the report the appropriate contractor and to the UTR.
- 6.1.10 For each subcontractor to the ER Project, the **BUS Contracts Administrator** will maintain a subcontractor-performance file that shall contain a copy of all evaluations performed.

6.2 Submit Subcontractor Feedback

6.2.1 The subcontractor will be given a maximum of 30 days to review and comment on the factual accuracy of the Report. The procurement specialist and the requester will review any such comments and determine whether the assigned ratings should be adjusted. A copy of the final report, if revised, must be provided to the subcontractor.

6.2.2 The ultimate determination of the subcontractor's performance rests with the Laboratory.

6.3 Perform Lessons Learned

During the performance of work, **ER Project personnel** shall identify, document, and submit lessons learned, as appropriate, in accordance with QP-3.2, Lessons Learned.

7.0 RECORDS

The **BUS** is responsible for maintaining the following records in the ER Project BUS Procurement Office.

7.1 Subcontractor Performance Evaluation Report (Attachment B)

7.2 Subcontractor Safety Evaluation Report (Attachment C)

8.0 TRAINING

8.1 All users of this QP are trained by self-study, and the training is documented in accordance with QP-2.2, Personnel Orientation and Training, appropriately documented in the ER Project Training Database located at <http://erinternal.lanl.gov/Training/Training.asp>.

8.2 The **FAPL** will monitor the proper implementation of this procedure and ensures that the users of this QP complete all applicable training assignments in accordance with QP-2.2, Personnel Orientation and Training.

9.0 ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Subcontractor Performance Evaluation Criteria (4 pages)

Attachment B: Subcontractor Performance Evaluation Report (1 page) located at <http://erinternal.lanl.gov/Quality/user/forms.asp>.

Attachment C: Subcontractor Safety Evaluation Report (1 page) located at <http://erinternal.lanl.gov/Quality/user/forms.asp>

[Using a token card, click here to record "self-study" training to this procedure.](#)

If you do not possess a token card or encounter problems, contact the RRES-ECR training specialist.

Subcontractor Performance Evaluation Criteria

	Unsatisfactory 1	Marginal 2	Satisfactory 3	Very Good 4	Exceptional 5
Schedule					
Compliance with Planned Schedule	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many deliverables were past due. Delays are compromising a project. Ineffective corrective actions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some deliverables were past due. Delays required assistance from LANL to ensure achievement of subcontract requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All deliverables were received on time. Experienced minor problems that did not affect delivery schedule. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All deliverables were received on time with some early deliveries to the Laboratory's benefit. Quickly resolved delivery issues; effective corrective actions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All deliverables were received on time with many early deliveries to the Laboratory's benefit.
Submittal of Administrative Deliverables (e.g., 75% notifications, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Required notifications or deliverables such as administrative reports or accruals not submitted by the required deadline. Delay compromised the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Required notifications or deliverables such as administrative reports or accruals not submitted by the required deadline. Project not compromised. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All deadlines and planned delivery schedules met. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This scoring option not applicable to this scoring criterion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This scoring option not applicable to this scoring criterion.
Notification of Anticipated Delay of Regulatory Deliverables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Laboratory not notified of anticipated delay. Delay seriously compromised the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Laboratory not notified of anticipated delay in a timely fashion. Delay compromised the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Laboratory notified of anticipated delay in a timely fashion, and project experienced minor compromise. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Laboratory notified of anticipated delay such that the project is not seriously compromised. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Laboratory notified of anticipated delay such that the project is not compromised.

Subcontractor Performance Evaluation Criteria

	Unsatisfactory 1	Marginal 2	Satisfactory 3	Very Good 4	Exceptional 5
Work Products and Program Implementation					
Thoroughness and Accuracy of Work (Field Work and Documents)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many performance requirements, as detailed in the Statement of Work (SOW), were not met. Performance reflects significant problems. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some minor performance requirements, as detailed in the SOW, were not met. Performance reflects problems. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All performance requirements, as detailed in the SOW, were met. No significant problems. Minor problems resolved with satisfactory corrective actions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance requirements, as detailed in the SOW, were exceeded to the benefit of the Laboratory. No significant problems. Minor problems resolved with satisfactory corrective actions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance requirements, as detailed in the SOW, were greatly exceeded to the benefit of the Laboratory. No significant problems. Minor problems resolved with highly effective corrective actions that resulted in improved performance/quality.
Quality Program Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-compliance with quality assurance requirements is severe. Corrective activity slow or ineffective. Portions of project significantly compromised. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-compliance with quality assurance requirements. Corrective activity slow or ineffective. Portions of project compromised. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrequent noncompliance with Quality Program requirements. Timely and effective corrective actions implemented. No serious impact to project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very minor noncompliance with quality program. Effective corrective activities or recommendations lead to process improvement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exemplary compliance with quality program requirements. Quality processes significantly improved as a result of input from the subcontractor.
Compliance with Environmental /Waste Management Regulations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Serious noncompliance with environmental regulations. Major impact to project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minor noncompliance with environmental regulations. Minor impact to project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full compliance to environmental regulations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full compliance to environmental regulations. Laboratory realizes minor benefits from process improvements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full compliance to environmental regulations. Laboratory realizes major benefits from process improvements.

Subcontractor Performance Evaluation Criteria

	Unsatisfactory 1	Marginal 2	Satisfactory 3	Very Good 4	Exceptional 5
Teamwork Effectiveness/ Communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cooperative spirit lacking. • Responses to inquiries/issues delinquent. • Did not maintain adequate, professional interactions with all required organizations. • Frequently failed to keep UTR informed of pertinent interactions with other organizations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relationship with other organizations strained. • Responses to inquiries/issues were inadequate. • Occasionally fails to keep UTR informed of pertinent interactions with others. • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasonably responsive staff. • Expectations met. • UTR informed of pertinent interactions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional and responsive staff. • Expectations exceeded. • UTR informed of pertinent interactions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highly professional, responsive, and proactive staff. • Significantly exceeded expectations. • UTR informed of pertinent interactions.
Cost					
Adherence to Cost Estimate [Not applicable to fixed price contracts.]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant cost overruns. • Not likely that subcontractor can recover cost controls. • Excessive and unnecessary change proposals to correct poor management with very untimely submittal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost/price estimates were not met. • Corrective action plans were inadequate. • No innovative techniques to bring overall expenditures within limits. • Change proposals were numerous and untimely. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost issues did not impact accomplishment of subcontract requirements. • Change proposals reasonable in number and submitted in reasonable amount of time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some reductions in overall cost/price while meeting all subcontract requirements. • No significant cost issues; minor issues resolved quickly. • Change proposals limited in number and submitted in a timely manner. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant reductions in overall cost/price while meeting all subcontract requirements. • Use of value engineering or other innovative management techniques. • No cost issues. • Minor changes implemented without cost impact. • Change proposals few in number and submitted in timely manner.

Subcontractor Performance Evaluation Criteria

	Unsatisfactory 1	Marginal 2	Satisfactory 3	Very Good 4	Exceptional 5
Safety (Use Attachment C)					
Adherence to Site-Specific Health & Safety Plan (SSHASP) and Health and Safety Plan (HASP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subcontractor had three or more violations of the written SSHASP, HASP, or OSHA regulations. Corrective action to any single violation was not rapid and responsive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subcontractor had two violations of the written SSHASP, HASP, or OSHA regulations. Corrective action to any single violation was not rapid and responsive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subcontractor had one violation of the written SSHASP, HASP, or OSHA regulations. Corrective action to violation was timely and responsive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subcontractor had only very minor violations of the written SSHASP, HASP on a high-risk activity. Corrective action to minor violation was proactive and responsive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This scoring option not applicable to this scoring criterion.
Occurrence of OSHA-type Imminent Safety or Health Incident (Category I) or Serious Safety or Health Incident (Category II)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The occurrence of any three or more serious safety/health incidents (Category II) or one imminent safety/ health incident (Category I). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The occurrence of two serious safety/ health incidents (Category II) or one imminent safety/ health incident (Category I). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The occurrence of one serious safety/ health incidents (Category II). Timely and responsive action. The occurrence of up to three other than serious incidents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No imminent, serious, or other-than-serious safety/health incidents. Timely, responsive, and proactive approach to safety. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This scoring option not applicable to this scoring criterion.
Lower-Tier Subcontractor Safety Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subcontractor did not manage lower-tier subcontractor safety performance that (in the opinion of the UTR) resulted in one Category I safety incident or three or more Category II safety incidents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subcontractor did not manage lower-tier subcontractor safety performance that (in the opinion of the UTR) resulted two Category II safety incidents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subcontractor did not manage lower-tier subcontractor safety performance that (in the opinion of the UTR) resulted in one Category II safety incident. Timely and responsive action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This scoring option not applicable to this scoring criterion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This scoring option not applicable to this scoring criterion.

Subcontractor Performance-Evaluation Report

Subcontractor: _____ Date of Report: _____

Contract number / Task Number: _____ Evaluation Period: _____

Task / Subtask Description: _____

Criteria	Performance Rating
Compliance with Planned Schedule	_____
Comments: _____	
Submittal of Administrative Deliverables	_____
Comments: _____	
Notification of Anticipated Delays of Regulatory Deliverables	_____
Comments: _____	
Thoroughness and Accuracy of Work	_____
Comments: _____	
Quality Program Implementation	_____
Comments: _____	
Compliance with Environmental/Waste Management Regulations	_____
Comments: _____	
Teamwork Effectiveness/Communication	_____
Comments: _____	
Adherence to cost estimate	_____
Comments: _____	
Total: _____	
Operational Performance Rating	
<p>Instructions:</p> <p>To determine the "Operational Performance Rating", scores should be normalized to 100% using the "Satisfactory" score ranking of 3 as the norm. Scoring criteria not applicable to the task are not utilized in the scoring. For example, scores of 3, 2, 3, 1, 4, NA, 3, 3 for each of the above 8 criteria would be $(19/(7 \times 3)) \times 100 = 90\%$.</p>	
<p>Overall performance narrative:</p>	
<p>UTR Signature: _____ (Date) _____</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Print name and title, then sign)</p> <p>FAPL Signature: _____ (Date) _____</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Print name and focus area, then sign)</p> <p>Contract Administrator Signature: _____ (Date) _____</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Print name, then sign)</p>	

Subcontractor Safety-Evaluation Report

Contractor: _____ Date of Report: _____

Contract number / Task Number: _____ Evaluation Period: _____

Task / Subtask Description: _____

Criteria	Performance Rating
----------	--------------------

Adherence to Site-Specific Health and Safety Plan/Health & Safety Plan/OSHA Regulations	
---	--

Comments: _____

Occurrence of OSHA -type Imminent Safety or Health Incidents (Category I) or Serious Safety or Health Incidents (Category II)	
---	--

Comments: _____

Lower-tier Subcontractor Safety Performance	
---	--

Comments: _____

Total: _____

Safety Performance Rating	
---------------------------------	--

Instructions:

To determine the "Operational Performance Rating", scores should be normalized to 100% using the "Satisfactory" score ranking of 3 as the norm. Scoring criteria not applicable to the task are not utilized in the scoring. For example, scores of 3, 2 3, 1, 4, NA, 3, 3 for each of the above 8 criteria would be $(19/(7 \times 3)) \times 100 = 90\%$.

UTR: _____ (Print name and title, then sign)	_____ (Date)
---	-----------------

FAPL: _____ (Print name and focus area, then sign)	_____ (Date)
---	-----------------

Contract Administrator: _____ (Print name and title, then sign)	_____ (Date)
--	-----------------

QP-7.3

Los Alamos
Environmental Restoration Project